arXiv:1302.7014v1 [cs.DS] 27 Feb 2013

# Parallel Peeling Algorithms

Jiayang Jiang * Michael Mitzenmacher† Justin Thaler ‡

March 1, 2013

**Abstract**

The analysis of several algorithms and data structures can be framed as a *peeling process* on a random hypergraph: vertices with degree less than $k$ are removed until there are no vertices of degree less than $k$ left. The remaining hypergraph is known as the $k$-core. In this paper, we analyze parallel peeling processes, where in each round, all vertices of degree less than $k$ are removed. It is known that, below a specific edge density threshold, the $k$-core is empty with high probability. We show that, with high probability, below this threshold, only $\frac{1}{\log((k-1)(r-1))}\log\log n + O(1)$ rounds of peeling are needed to obtain the empty $k$-core for $r$-uniform hypergraphs. Interestingly, we show that above this threshold, $\Omega(\log n)$ rounds of peeling are required to find the non-empty $k$-core. Since most algorithms and data structures aim to peel to an empty $k$-core, this asymmetry appears fortunate. We verify the theoretical results both with simulation and with a parallel implementation using graphical processing units (GPUs). Our implementation provides insights into how to structure parallel peeling algorithms for efficiency in practice.

## 1 Introduction

Consider the following *peeling process*: starting with a random hypergraph, vertices with degree less than $k$ are repeatedly removed, together with their associated edges. This yields what is called the $k$-core of the hypergraph, which is the maximal subgraph where each vertex has degree at least $k$. This greedy peeling process, and variations on it, have found applications in low-density parity-check codes [6, 9], hash-based sketches [4], satisfiability of random boolean formulae [2, 11], and cuckoo hashing [12]. Frequently, the question in these settings is whether or not the $k$-core is empty. As we discuss further below, it is known that below a specific edge density threshold, the $k$-core is empty with high probability. This asymptotic result in fact accurately predicts practical performance quite well: peeling produces algorithms with very fast running times, generally linear in the size of the graph.

Because of its simplicity and effectiveness, peeling-based approaches appear potentially very useful for problems involving large data sets. In this paper, we focus on expanding this applicability by examining the use of parallelism in conjunction with peeling. Peeling seems particularly amenable to parallel processing via the following simple round-based algorithm: in each round, all vertices of degree less than $k$ and their

*Harvard University, School of Engineering and Applied Sciences. Supported in part by NSF grants CCF-0915922 and IIS-0964473.

†Harvard University, School of Engineering and Applied Sciences. Supported in part by NSF grants CCF-0915922, IIS-0964473, and CNS-1011840.

‡Harvard University, School of Engineering and Applied Sciences. Supported by an NSF Graduate Research Fellowship and NSF grant CCF-0915922.

adjacent edges are removed in parallel from the graph. The major question we study is: how many rounds are necessary before peeling is complete?

We show that, with high probability, below the edge density threshold where the $k$-core is empty, only $\frac{1}{\log((k-1)(r-1))}\log\log n + O(1)$ rounds of peeling are needed for $r$-uniform hypergraphs. Specifically, we show that the fraction of vertices that remain in each round decreases doubly exponentially, in a manner similar in spirit to existing analyses of load-balancing problems [1, 7]. Interestingly, we show in contrast that at edge densities above the threshold, with high probability $\Omega(\log n)$ rounds of peeling are required to find the non-empty $k$-core. Since most algorithms and data structures that use peeling aim for an empty $k$-core, the fact that empty $k$-cores are faster to find in parallel than non-empty ones appears fortuitous: the algorithms will take $O(\log\log n)$ rounds when they succeed.

We then consider some of the details in implementation, focusing on the algorithmic example of Invertible Bloom Lookup Tables (IBLTs) [4]. An IBLT stores a set of keys, with each key being hashed into $r$ cells in a hash table, and all keys in a cell XORed together. The IBLT defines a random hypergraph, where keys correspond to edges, and cells to vertices. As we describe later, recovering the set of keys from the IBLT corresponds to peeling on the associated hypergraph. Applications of IBLTs are further discussed in [4]; they can be used, for example, for sparse recovery [4] and simple low-density parity-check codes [9].

Perhaps surprisingly, we cannot find an analysis of parallel peeling in the literature, although early work by Karp, Luby, and Meyer auf der Heide on PRAM simulation uses an algorithm similar to peeling to obtain $O(\log\log n)$ bounds for load balancing [5], and we use other load balancing arguments [1, 13] for inspiration. We also rely heavily on the framework established by Molloy [11] for analyzing the $k$-core of random hypergraphs.

## 2 The High-Level Argument for the $k$-Core

For constants $r \geq 3$ and $c$, let $G^r_{n,cn}$ denote a random hypergraph with $n$ vertices and $cn$ hyperedges, where each hyperedge consists of $r$ distinct vertices. Previous analysis of random hypergraphs have determined the threshold values $c^*_{k,r}$ such that when $c < c^*_{k,r}$, the $k$-core is empty with probability $1 - o(1)$, and when $c > c^*_{k,r}$, the $k$-core is non-empty with probability $1 - o(1)$. For example, it follows from [11] that $c^*_{2,r} = \min_{x>0} \frac{x}{r(1-e^{-x})^{r-1}}$; we find $c^*_{2,3} \approx 0.818$.

The neighborhood of $v$ can be accurately modeled as a branching process, with a random number of edges adjacent to this vertex, and similarly a random number of edges adjacent to each of those vertices, and so on. For intuition, we assume this branching process yields a tree, and further that the number of adjacent edges is distributed according to a discrete Poisson distribution with mean $rc$. These assumptions are sufficiently accurate for our analysis, as we later prove. (See e.g. [3, 11] for similar arguments.)

The intuition for the main result comes from considering the (tree) neighborhood of $v$, and applying the following algorithm: for $1 \leq i \leq t-1$, in round $i$, look at all the vertices at distance $t-i$ and delete a vertex if it has fewer than $k-1$ child edges. Finally, in round $t$, $v$ is deleted if it has degree less than $k$. Vertex $v$ survives after $t$ rounds of parallel peeling if and only if it survives after $t$ rounds of this algorithm.

In what follows, we denote the probability that $v$ survives after $t$ rounds in this model by $\lambda_t$, and the probability a vertex $u$ at distance $t-i$ from $v$ survives $i$ rounds by $\rho_i$.

Here $\rho_0 = 1$. In this idealized setting, the following relationships hold:

$$\rho_i = \Pr(\text{Poisson}(\rho_{i-1}^{r-1} rc) \geq k-1),$$

and similarly

$$\lambda_i = \Pr(\text{Poisson}(\rho_{i-1}^{r-1} rc) \geq k).$$

The recursion for $\rho_i$ arises as follows; each node $u$ has a Poisson distributed number of descendant edges with mean $rc$, and each edge has $r-1$ additional vertices that survive $i-1$ rounds with probability $\rho_{i-1}$. By the splitting property of Poisson distributions [8][Chapter 5], the number of surviving descendant edges of $u$ is Poisson distributed with mean $\rho_{i-1}^{r-1} rc$, and this must be at least $k-1$ for $u$ to itself survive the $i$th round.

For convenience, we define

$$\beta_i = \rho_{i-1}^{r-1} rc.$$

Then,

$$\rho_i = 1 - e^{-\beta_i} \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} \frac{{\beta_i}^j}{j!},$$

$$\lambda_i = 1 - e^{-\beta_i} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \frac{{\beta_i}^j}{j!},$$

$$\beta_{i+1} = \left[1 - e^{-\beta_i} \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} \frac{{\beta_i}^j}{j!}\right]^{r-1} rc.$$

When $c < c_k^*$, which is the setting where we know the core becomes empty, we have $\lim_{t\to\infty} \rho_t = 0$, so $\lim_{t\to\infty} \beta_t = 0$. Thus, for any constant $\tau > 0$, we can choose a constant $I$ such that $\beta_I \leq \tau$.

For any $x > 0$ and $k \geq 2$, by basic calculus, we have $1 - e^{-x} \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} \frac{x^j}{j!} \leq \frac{x^{k-1}}{(k-1)!}$. Applying this bound to $\beta_{I+1}$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_{I+1} &\leq \left[\frac{\beta_I^{k-1}}{(k-1)!}\right]^{r-1} rc \\ &\leq \beta_I^{(k-1)(r-1)} \frac{rc}{[(k-1)!]^{r-1}}.\end{aligned}$$

Using induction, we can show that

$$\beta_{I+t} \leq \beta_I^{[(k-1)(r-1)]^t} \left[\frac{rc}{[(k-1)!]^{r-1}}\right]^{\frac{[(k-1)(r-1)]^t - 1}{(k-1)(r-1)-1}}.$$

If $\frac{rc}{[(k-1)!]^{r-1}} \geq 1$, we can apply the upper bound $\beta_{I+t} \leq \left[\tau\left(\frac{rc}{[(k-1)!]^{r-1}}\right)^{\frac{1}{(k-1)(r-1)-1}}\right]^{[(k-1)(r-1)]^t}$, and if $\frac{rc}{[(k-1)!]^{r-1}} < 1$, then $\beta_{I+t} \leq \tau^{[(k-1)(r-1)]^t}$. Setting $\tau' = \max(\tau\left(\frac{rc}{[(k-1)!]^{r-1}}\right)^{\frac{1}{(k-1)(r-1)-1}}, \tau)$ gives

$$\beta_{I+t} \leq (\tau')^{[(k-1)(r-1)]^t}.$$

Pick $\tau$ such that $\tau' < 1$. The definition of $\lambda_i$ and applying the same upper bound gives

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_{I+t} &\leq \frac{\beta_{I+t}^k}{k!} \\ &\leq \frac{(\tau')^{k[(k-1)(r-1)]^t}}{k!}.\end{aligned}$$

Solving $\frac{(\tau')^{k[(k-1)(r-1)]^t}}{k!} < n^{-2}$ gives $t > \frac{1}{\log((k-1)(r-1))} \log\log n + O(1)$. This shows that it takes $t^* = \frac{1}{\log((k-1)(r-1))} \log\log n + O(1)$ rounds for $\lambda_t n = o(1)$ in our idealized setting.

## 3 Completing the Argument

To formalize the argument above, we first note that instead of working in the $G^r_{n,cn}$ model, we adopt the standard approach of having each hyperedge independently in the graph with probability $q = cn/\binom{n}{r}$. It can be shown easily that the result in this model yields the result in the $G^r_{n,cn}$ model (see e.g. [3, 11]).

We also note the following lemma, that we make use of throughout.

**Lemma 1.** *For any constant $c_1 > 0$, there is a constant $c_2 > 0$ such that with high probability, for all vertices $v$, the neighborhood of distance $c_1 \log\log n$ around $v$ contains at most $\log^{c_2} n$ vertices.*

*Proof.* The result appears in the dissertation of Voll [14][Lemma 3.3.1]. Denoting by $N_d$ the number of vertices at distance $d$ in the neighborhood of a root vertex $u$ for a Poisson branching process with constant mean $c > 1$, he proves that for $\varepsilon < 0.029$,

$$\Pr(N_d \geq \frac{1}{2}\log(1/\varepsilon)(3c)^d) \leq d\varepsilon.$$

Using $\varepsilon = 1/n^2$, he finds the number vertices in the neighborhood of distance up to $\alpha \log\log n$ around such a vertex is polylogarithmic with probability $1 - o(1/n)$, and the same holds with branching trees under the corresponding binomial branching process, and for neighborhoods around vertices of random graphs. Here, because we work with hypergraphs, each edge gives $r-1$ new child vertices instead of 1, but this only affects the calculations by constant factors. We conclude that the number of vertices in the neighborhood of a vertex in the $G^r_{n,cn}$ model is polylogarithmic with probability $1 - o(1/n)$. □

It will help us to introduce some terminology. We will recursively refer to a vertex other than the root as *peeled* in round $i$ if it has fewer than $k-1$ unpeeled descendant edges at the beginning of the round; similarly, an edge is peeled if some adjacent vertex is peeled. We say *unpeeled* for an edge or vertex that is not peeled. At round 0, all edges and vertices begin as unpeeled. For the root, we require fewer than $k$ unpeeled descendant edges before it is peeled.

We now prove the following theorem:

**Theorem 1.** *Let $r \geq 3$ and $k \geq 2$. With probability $1 - o(1)$, the parallel peeling process for the $k$-core in a random hypergraph with $r$-ary edges terminates after $\frac{1}{\log((k-1)(r-1))}\log\log n + O(1)$ rounds when $c < c^*_{k,r}$.*

*Proof.* **Deviations from Poisson:** We focus on how the process deviates from the idealized branching process, showing it leads to only lower order effects. We view the branching process as generating a breadth first search from the initial vertex. Note that, once a vertex is expanded in the breadth first search, it cannot be the child of a subsequent vertex. Also, the number of edges adjacent to a vertex is not Poisson distributed, but a binomial random variable, as each edge appears independently with probability $q = cn/\binom{n}{r}$. Let $Z_u$ be the number of already expanded vertices in the breadth first search when expanding a node $u$. Then the number of edges adjacent to $u$ is a binomial random variable with mean $\binom{n-Z_u-1}{r-1}q$. By Lemma 1, with high probability the neighborhood over the $O(\log\log n)$ levels we require is polylogarithmic in $n$, and conditioned on this event, the deviations introduced by $Z_u$ affects our estimates of $\beta_i$ and $\lambda_i$ by sublinear amounts. By a straightforward analysis using Le Cam's Theorem, we can bound the deviations in $\beta_i$ and $\lambda_i$ introduced by the difference between our idealized Poisson model and the actual binomial distribution by only $o(n^{-1/6})$. As long as $\beta_i$ and $\lambda_i$ are $\Omega(n^{-1/6})$, the recursive equations for $\beta_i$ and $\lambda_i$ are accurate up to $1 + o(1)$ factors with high probability.

Two issues remain. First, we have to get $\lambda_i$ down fully to $o(1/n)$, not $\Omega(n^{-1/6})$, so we can apply a union bound over all the vertices. We first show how to do this assuming the neighborhood is a tree. Second,

we may have duplicated vertices as we expand the neighborhood. When duplicates appear, parts of our neighborhood tree expansion are no longer independent, as in our idealized analysis. We show how to modify the analysis to cope with duplicate vertices.

**Bounding $\lambda_i$ for Trees:** Under the assumption that the neighborhood is a tree, we can get the error probability down to $o(1/n)$.

Note that for the root to be unpeeled after $i$ rounds, there must be at least $k \geq 2$ adjacent unpeeled edges, corresponding to at least 4 (distinct, from our tree assumption) unpeeled children vertices that after $i-1$ rounds, since $r \geq 3$. Correspondingly, there must be at least 8 (distinct) unpeeled vertices after $i-2$ rounds, since each of the 4 unpeeled children of the root must have one adjacent unpeeled edge with 2 vertices that are grandchildren of the root, corresponding to at least 8 unpeeled vertices. We have shown that each vertex remains unpeeled for at most $t^* = \frac{1}{\log((k-1)(r-1))}\log\log n + O(1)$ rounds with probability $o(n^{-1/6})$. These 8 unpeeled vertices can be chosen from the at most polylogarithmic number of grandchildren, which gives $\binom{\text{polylog}(n)}{8} = \text{polylog}(n)$ possible sets of choices. Hence, via a union bound, the probability that $v$ survives $t^*+2$ rounds is $(\text{polylog}(n)n^{-1/6})^8 = o(1/n)$. We can take a union bound over all vertices for our final $1-o(1)$ bound.

**Dealing with duplicate vertices:** Finally, we now explain that, with probability $1-o(1)$, we need worry only about a single duplicate vertex in the neighborhood for all vertices, and further that this only adds an additive constant to the number of parallel rounds required. As we expand the neighborhood using breadth first search, the probability of a duplicate vertex occurring during any expansion step is only $\text{polylog}(n)/n$. As the neighborhood contains only a polylogarithmic number of vertices, the probability of having at least two duplicate vertices within the neighborhood of any vertex is $o(1/n)$.

It is therefore sufficient to show that having one duplicate vertex in the neighborhood only adds a constant number of rounds to the parallel peeling process. Consider what happens when a vertex $u$ is duplicated. This creates an obvious dependence, that we would like to avoid in our argument. Hence, if we encounter a duplicate, we pessimistically assume that it prevents two vertices adjacent from the root from peeling. Even with this assumption, we show that simply adding one additional layer of expansion in the neighborhood allows the root to peel by round $t^*+3$ with high probability.

Consider what happens in $t^*+3$ rounds when there is 1 duplicate vertex. In order for the root to remain unpeeled, it must have at least 4 (not necessarily distinct) vertices at distance 1 that are unpeeled at round $t^*+2$. At most two of these four vertices have a descendant that is a duplicate or is itself a duplicate. Hence, for the root to remain unpeeled, for at least $t^*+2$ rounds, at least two vertices must remain unpeeled out of the $\text{polylog}(n)$ children of the root, when the neighborhood of these vertices for $t^*+2$ rounds is a tree. By our previous calculations, the probability that this occurs is $o(1/n)$, completing the proof. □

*Remark:* One can obtain better than $1-o(1)$ bounds on the probability of terminating after $\frac{1}{\log((k-1)(r-1))}\log\log n + O(1)$ rounds when $c < c^*_{k,r}$. For example, $1-o(1/n)$ bounds are possible when $r > 3$; the argument requires considering cases for the possibility that 2 vertices are duplicated in the neighborhood around a vertex. However, one cannot hope for probability bounds of $1-o(1/n^a)$ for an arbitrary constant $a$ when duplicate edges may appear, as is typical for hashing applications. The probability the $k$-core is not empty because $k$ edges share the same $r$ vertices $\Omega(n^{-kr+k+r})$ for constant $k$, $r$, and graphs with a linear number of hyperedges, which is already $\Omega(1/n)$ for $k=2$ and $r=3$.

# 4 Above the Threshold

Now consider the case when $c > c^*_{k,r}$. We show that parallel peeling requires $\Omega(\log n)$ rounds in this case.

Molloy [11] showed that in this case there exists a $\rho > 0$ such that $\lim_{t\to\infty} \rho_t = \rho$. Similarly, $\lim_{t\to\infty} \beta_t = \beta > 0$ and $\lim_{t\to\infty} \lambda_t = \lambda > 0$. It follows that the core will have size $\lambda n + o(n)$. We examine how $\beta_t$ and $\lambda_t$ approach their limiting values to show that the parallel peeling algorithm takes $\Omega(\log n)$ rounds.

**Theorem 2.** *Let $r \geq 3$ and $k \geq 2$. With probability $1 - o(1)$, the parallel peeling process for the k-core in a random hypergraph with r-ary edges terminates after $\Omega(\log n)$ rounds when $c > c^*_{k,r}$,*

*Proof.* First, let $\beta_i = \beta + \varepsilon$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$. We begin by working in the idealized branching process model given in Section 2 to determine the behavior of $\beta_i$:

$$\beta_{i+1} = \left[1 - e^{-\beta-\varepsilon} \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} \frac{(\beta+\varepsilon)^j}{j!}\right]^{r-1} r.$$

Note $\beta$ corresponds to the fixed point

$$\beta = \left[1 - e^{-\beta} \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} \frac{\beta^j}{j!}\right]^{r-1} rc.$$

Let $S_{k-2} = \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} \frac{\beta^j}{j!}$ and $S_{k-3} = \sum_{j=0}^{k-3} \frac{\beta^j}{j!}$, where $S_{k-3} = 0$ if $k = 2$. Then, $\sum_{j=0}^{k-2} \frac{(\beta+\varepsilon)^j}{j!} = S_{k-2} + S_{k-3}\varepsilon + O(\varepsilon^2)$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_{i+1} &= \left[1 - e^{-\beta-\varepsilon}(S_{k-2} + S_{k-3}\varepsilon + O(\varepsilon^2))\right]^{r-1} rc \\
&= \left[1 - e^{-\beta} S_{k-2} + e^{-\beta} S_{k-2}[1 - e^{-\varepsilon} - e^{-\varepsilon}\frac{S_{k-3}}{S_{k-2}}\varepsilon - e^{-\varepsilon} O(\varepsilon^2)]\right]^{r-1} rc \\
&= \left[1 - e^{-\beta} S_{k-2} + e^{-\beta} S_{k-2}[(1 - S_{k-3}/S_{k-2})\varepsilon + O(\varepsilon^2)]\right]^{r-1} rc \\
&= (1 - e^{-\beta} S_{k-2})^{r-1} rc + (r-1)(1 - e^{-\beta} S_{k-2})^{r-2} e^{-\beta} S_{k-2}[(1 - S_{k-3}/S_{k-2})\varepsilon + O(\varepsilon^2)]rc + O(\varepsilon^2) \\
&= \beta + a\varepsilon + O(\varepsilon^2).
\end{aligned}$$

The penultimate line uses the Binomial Theorem. Here $a = \frac{(r-1)\beta e^{-\beta} S_{k-2}(1 - S_{k-3}/S_{k-2})}{1 - e^{-\beta} S_{k-2}}$ is a constant with $a < 1$.

Next, we know that $\lambda = 1 - e^{-\beta} S_{k-1}$. By the same calculation as above, it can be shown that

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_i &= \lambda + e^{-\beta} S_{k-1}(1 - S_{k-2}/S_{k-1})\varepsilon + O(\varepsilon^2), \\
\lambda_{i+1} &= \lambda + e^{-\beta} S_{k-1}(1 - S_{k-2}/S_{k-1}) a\varepsilon + O(\varepsilon^2).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, for suitably small $\varepsilon$ values, in each round $\lambda_i$ gets closer to $\lambda$ by at most some constant factor $a' = a + O(\varepsilon)$ under the idealized model. Under the $G^r_{n,cn}$ model, suitable martingale concentration arguments apply (see e.g. [2, 11]), and errors in the recursion due to duplicate vertices in the neighborhood do not have a significant effect. That is, for $t = \gamma \log n$ for a suitably small $\gamma$, we can show that for all $i$ with $1 \leq i \leq t$, concentration bounds yield that $\lambda_i$ is close to its expectation. Further, the effect of duplicate vertices on $\lambda_t$ can be made at most $o(n^{-1/6})$. We choose $\gamma$ so that $\lambda_t$ is $t = \Omega(\log n)$ but $\lambda_t$ in the idealized model is $\Omega(n^{-1/6})$. It follows that in the $G^r_{n,cn}$ model, the number of vertices that survive some $t = \Omega(\log n)$ parallel rounds is at least $\Omega(n^{5/6})$ when $c > c^*_{k,r}$. □

*Remark:* While our experimental evidence and the recursion lead us to conjecture that there is a corresponding $O(\log n)$ upper bound when above the threshold $c^*_{k,r}$, we have not found a straightforward way to prove this fact. For our purposes, it is the distinction in behavior of the parallel algorithm above and below the threshold that is important, but we believe it would also be useful to have the upper bound in this case.

| | $c = 0.7$ | | $c = 0.75$ | | $c = 0.8$ | | $c = 0.85$ | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $n$ | Failed | Rounds | Failed | Rounds | Failed | Rounds | Failed | Rounds |
| 10000 | 0 | 12.504 | 0 | 23.352 | 1000 | 17.037 | 1000 | 10.773 |
| 20000 | 0 | 12.594 | 0 | 23.433 | 1000 | 19.028 | 1000 | 11.928 |
| 40000 | 0 | 12.791 | 0 | 23.343 | 1000 | 20.961 | 1000 | 12.992 |
| 80000 | 0 | 12.939 | 0 | 23.372 | 1000 | 22.959 | 1000 | 14.104 |
| 160000 | 0 | 12.983 | 0 | 23.421 | 1000 | 25.066 | 1000 | 15.005 |
| 320000 | 0 | 13.000 | 0 | 23.491 | 1000 | 27.089 | 1000 | 16.305 |
| 640000 | 0 | 13.000 | 0 | 23.564 | 1000 | 29.281 | 1000 | 17.334 |
| 1280000 | 0 | 13.000 | 0 | 23.716 | 1000 | 31.037 | 1000 | 18.499 |
| 2560000 | 0 | 13.000 | 0 | 23.840 | 1000 | 33.172 | 1000 | 19.570 |

Table 1: Results of simulations using $r = 4$ and $k = 2$, over 1000 trials.

# 5 Experimental Results

We implemented a simulation of the parallel peeling algorithm, using the $G^r_{n,cn}$ model where each edge is chosen independently and uniformly from the set of $\binom{n}{r}$ possible edges. To check the growth of the number of rounds as a function of $n$, we ran the program 1000 times for $r = 4, k = 2$ and various values of $n$ and $c$, and computed the average number of rounds for the peeling process to complete. For reference, $c^*_{2,4} \approx 0.772$. Table 1 shows the results.

For all the experiments, when $c < c^*_{2,4}$, all 1000 trials succeeded (empty $k$-core) and when $c > c^*_{2,4}$, all 1000 trials failed (non-empty $k$-core). This is unsurprising given the distance from the asymptotic threshold. For $c < c^*_{2,4}$, the average number of rounds increases very slowly with $n$, while for $c > c^*_{2,4}$, the average increases approximately linearly in $\log n$. This is in accord with our $O(\log\log n)$ result below the threshold and $\Omega(\log n)$ result above the threshold. The results for other values of $r$ and $k$ were similar.

Another experiment we did was to test how well idealized values from the recurrence for $\lambda_t$ approximates the fraction of vertices left after $t$ rounds. In the following tests, we used $r = 4, k = 2$ and $n = 1$ million. For each value of $c$, we averaged over 1000 trials. Table 2 shows that the recurrence indeed describes the behavior of the peeling process quite well, both below and above the threshold.

# 6 GPU Implementation

## 6.1 Motivation

Using a graphics processing unit (GPU), we developed a parallel implementation for Invertible Bloom Lookup Tables (IBLTs), a data structure recently proposed by Goodrich and Mitzenmacher [4]. Two motivating applications are sparse recovery [4] and efficiently encodable and decodable error correcting codes [9]. For brevity we describe here only the sparse recovery application.

In the sparse recovery problem, $N$ items are inserted into a set $S$, and subsequently all but $n$ of the items are deleted. The goal is to recover the exact set $S$, using space proportional to the final number of items $n$, which can be much smaller than the total number of items $N$ that were ever inserted. IBLTs achieve this roughly as follows. The IBLT maintains $O(n)$ cells, where each cell contains a key field and a checksum field. We use $r$ hash functions $h_1, \ldots, h_r$. When an item $x$ is inserted or deleted from $S$, we consider the $r$ cells $h_1(x) \ldots h_r(x)$, and we XOR the key field of each of these cells with $x$, and we XOR the checksum field

| $c = 0.7$ | | |
|---|---|---|
| $t$ | Prediction | Experiment |
| 1 | 768922 | 768925 |
| 2 | 673647 | 673664 |
| 3 | 608076 | 608097 |
| 4 | 553064 | 553091 |
| 5 | 500466 | 500503 |
| 6 | 444828 | 444872 |
| 7 | 380873 | 380930 |
| 8 | 302531 | 302607 |
| 9 | 204442 | 204550 |
| 10 | 93245 | 93398 |
| 11 | 14159 | 14269 |
| 12 | 74 | 78 |
| 13 | 0.00001 | 0 |
| 14 | 0 | 0 |
| 15 | 0 | 0 |
| 16 | 0 | 0 |
| 17 | 0 | 0 |
| 18 | 0 | 0 |
| 19 | 0 | 0 |
| 20 | 0 | 0 |

| $c = 0.85$ | | |
|---|---|---|
| $t$ | Prediction | Experiment |
| 1 | 853158 | 853172 |
| 2 | 811184 | 811200 |
| 3 | 793026 | 793042 |
| 4 | 784269 | 784281 |
| 5 | 779841 | 779851 |
| 6 | 777550 | 777559 |
| 7 | 776350 | 776359 |
| 8 | 775719 | 775728 |
| 9 | 775385 | 775394 |
| 10 | 775209 | 775218 |
| 11 | 775115 | 775124 |
| 12 | 775066 | 775074 |
| 13 | 775039 | 775048 |
| 14 | 775025 | 775034 |
| 15 | 775018 | 775026 |
| 16 | 775014 | 775022 |
| 17 | 775012 | 775020 |
| 18 | 775011 | 775019 |
| 19 | 775010 | 775018 |
| 20 | 775010 | 775018 |

Table 2: Results of simulations on how well the recursion approximates the number of vertices left after $t$ rounds. The experiments are run using $r = 4, k = 2, n = 1$ million, over 1000 trials.

of each of these cells with checkSum$(x)$, where checkSum is some simple pseudorandom function. Notice that the insertion and deletion procedures are identical.

In order to recover the set $S$, we iteratively look for "pure" cells – these are cells that only contains one item $x$ in the final set $S$. Every time we find a pure cell whose key field is $x$, we recover $x$ and delete $x$ from $S$, which hopefully creates new pure cells. We continue until there are no more pure cells, or we have fully recovered the set $S$.

The IBLT defines a random $r$-uniform hypergraph $G$, in which vertices correspond to cells in the IBLT, and edges correspond to items in the set $S$. Pure cells in the IBLT correspond to vertices of degree less than $k = 2$. The IBLT recovery procedure precisely corresponds to a peeling process on $G$, and the recovery procedure is successful if and only if the 2-core of $G$ is empty.

## 6.2 Implementation Details

Our parallel IBLT implementation consists of two stages: the insertion/deletion stage, during which items are inserted and deleted from the IBLT, and the recovery phase. Both phases can be parallelized.

One method of parallelizing the insertion/deletion phase is as follows: we devote a separate thread to each item to be inserted or deleted. A caveat is that multiple threads may try to modify a single cell at any point in time, and so we have to use atomic XOR operations, so that threads trying to write to the same cell do not interfere with each other. In general, atomic operations can be a bottleneck in any parallel implementation; if $t$ threads try to write to the same memory location, the algorithm will take at least $t$ (serial) time steps.

We parallelize the recovery phase as follows. We proceed in rounds, and in each round we devote a single

thread to each cell in the IBLT. Each thread checks if its cell is pure, and if so it identifies the item contained in the cell, removes all $r$ occurrences of the item from the IBLT, and marks the cell as recovered. The implementation proceeds until it reaches an iteration where no items are recovered – this can be checked by summing up (in parallel) the number of cells marked recovered after each round, and stopping when this number does not change. This procedure also requires atomic XOR operations, as two threads may simultaneously try to write to the same cell if there are two or more items $x \neq y$ recovered in the same round such that $h_i(x) = h_i(y)$ for some $1 \leq i \leq r$.

In addition, we must take care to avoid deleting an item multiple times for the IBLT. Indeed, since any item $x$ inserted into the IBLT is placed into $r$ cells, $x$ might be contained in multiple pure cells at any instant, and the thread devoted to each such pure cell may try to delete $x$. To prevent this, we split the table up into $r$ subtables, and hash each item into one cell in each subtable upon insertion and deletion. When we execute the recovery algorithm, we iterate through the subtables serially (which requires $r$ serial steps per round), processing each subtable in parallel. This ensures that an item $x$ only gets removed from the table once, since the first time a pure cell is found containing $x$, $x$ gets removed from all the other subtables. This recovery procedure corresponds to an interesting variant of the peeling process we analyze further in Section 7.

### 6.3 Experimental Results

All of our serial code was written in C++ and all experiments were compiled with g++ using the -O3 compiler optimization flag and run on a workstation with a 64-bit Intel Xeon architecture and 48 GBs of RAM. We implemented all of our GPU code in CUDA with all compiler optimizations turned on, and ran our GPU implementation on an NVIDIA Tesla C2070 GPU with 6 GBs of device memory.

**Summary of results.** Relative to our serial implementation, our GPU implementation achieves 10x-12x speedups for the insertion/deletion phase, and 20x speedups for the recovery stage when the edge density of the hypergraph is below the threshold for successful recovery (i.e. empty 2-core). When the edge density is slightly above the threshold for successful recovery, our parallel recovery implementation was only about 7x faster than our serial implementation. The reason for this is two-fold. Firstly, above the threshold, many more rounds of the parallel peeling process were necessary before the 2-core was found. Secondly, above the threshold, less work was required of the serial implementation because fewer items were recovered; in contrast, the parallel implementation examines every cell every round.

Our detailed experimental results are given in Tables 3 (for the case of $r = 3$ hash functions) and 4 (for the case of $r = 4$ hash functions). The timing results are averages over 10 trials each. For the GPU implementation, the reported times do count for the time to transfer data (i.e. the items to be inserted) from the CPU to the GPU.

The reported results are for a fixed IBLT size, consisting of $2^{24}$ cells. These results are representative for all sufficiently large input sizes: once the number of IBLT cells is larger than about $2^{19}$, the runtime of our parallel implementation, grows roughly linearly with the number of table cells (for any fixed table load). Here, table load refers to the ratio of the number of items in the IBLT to the number of cells in the IBLT. This corresponds to the value $c$ in the corresponding hypergraph. The linear increase in runtime above a certain input size is typical, and is due to the fact that there is a finite number of threads that the GPU can launch at any one time.

| Table Load | No. Table Cells | % Recovered | GPU Recovery Time | Serial Recovery Time | GPU Insert Time | Serial Insert Time |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0.75 | 16.8 million | 100% | 0.33 s | 6.37 s | 0.31 s | 3.91 s |
| 0.83 | 16.8 million | 50.1% | 0.42 s | 3.64 s | 0.35 s | 4.34 s |

Table 3: Results of our parallel and serial IBLT implementations with $r = 3$ hash functions. The table load refers to the ratio of the number of items in the IBLT to the number of cells in the IBLT.

| Table Load | No. Table Cells | % Recovered | GPU Recovery Time | Serial Recovery Time | GPU Insert Time | Serial Insert Time |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0.75 | 16.8 million | 100% | 0.47 s | 8.37 s | 0.42 s | 4.55 s |
| 0.83 | 16.8 million | 24.6% | 0.25 s | 2.28 s | 0.46 s | 5.0 s |

Table 4: Results of our parallel and serial IBLT implementations with $r = 4$ hash functions. The table load refers to the ratio of the number of items in the IBLT to the number of cells in the IBLT.

# 7 Parallel Peeling with Subtables

The parallel peeling process used in our GPU implementation of IBLTs in Section 6 does not precisely correspond to the one analyzed in Sections 3 and 4. The differences are two-fold. First, the underlying hypergraph $G$ in our IBLT implementation is not chosen uniformly from all $r$-uniform hypergraphs; instead, vertices in $G$ (i.e., IBLT cells) are partitioned into $r$ equal-sized sets (or subtables) of size $n/r$, and edges are chosen at random subject to the constraint that each edge contains exactly one vertex from each set. Second, the peeling process in our GPU implementation does not attempt to peel all vertices in each round. Instead, our GPU implementation proceeds in *subrounds*, where each round consists of $r$ subrounds. In the $i$th subround of a given round, we remove all the vertices of degree less than $k$ in the $i$th subtable. Note that running one round of this algorithm is not equivalent to running one round of the original parallel peeling algorithm. This is because peeling the first subtable may free up new peelable vertices in the second subtable, and so on. Hence, running one round of the algorithm used in our GPU implementation may remove more vertices than running one round of the original algorithm.

In this section, we analyze the peeling process used in our GPU implementation. We can use a similar approach as above to obtain the recursion for the survival probabilities for this algorithm. Let $\rho_{i,j}$ be the probability that a vertex in the tree survives $i$ rounds when it's in the $j$th subtable, with each $\rho_{0,j} = 1$. Then,

$$\rho_{i,j} = \Pr(\text{Poisson}(\prod_{h<j} \rho_{i,h} \prod_{h>j} \rho_{i-1,h} rc) \geq k-1).$$

By the same reasoning,

$$\lambda_{i,j} = \Pr(\text{Poisson}(\prod_{h<j} \rho_{i,h} \prod_{h>j} \rho_{i-1,h} rc) \geq k)$$

and we can consider

$$\beta_{i,j} = \prod_{h<j} \rho_{i,h} \prod_{h>j} \rho_{i-1,h} rc.$$

These equations differ from our original equation in a way similar to how the equations for standard multiple-choice load-balancing differ from Vöcking's asymmetric variation of multiple-choice load-balancing, where a hash table is similarly split into $r$ subtables, each item is given one choice by hashing in each subtable,

| | $c = 0.7$ | | $c = 0.75$ | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| $n$ | Failed | Subrounds | Failed | Subrounds |
| 10000 | 0 | 26.018 | 0 | 47.732 |
| 20000 | 0 | 26.142 | 0 | 47.659 |
| 40000 | 0 | 26.273 | 0 | 47.666 |
| 80000 | 0 | 26.452 | 0 | 47.783 |
| 160000 | 0 | 26.585 | 0 | 47.769 |
| 320000 | 0 | 26.790 | 0 | 47.925 |
| 640000 | 0 | 26.957 | 0 | 48.070 |
| 1280000 | 0 | 27.006 | 0 | 48.141 |
| 2560000 | 0 | 27.012 | 0 | 48.175 |

Table 5: Results of simulations of peeling with subtables using $r = 4$ and $k = 2$, over 1000 trials.

and the item is placed in the least loaded subtable, breaking ties according to some fixed ordering of the subtables [10, 13].

Motivated by this, we can show that in this variation, below the threshold, these values eventually decrease "Fibonacci exponentially", that is, with the exponent falling according to a generalized Fibonacci sequence. We follow the same approach as outlined in Section 2. Let $\beta'_m = \beta_{i,j}$ where $m = (i-1)r + j$, and similarly for $\lambda'_m$ and $\rho'_m$, so we may work in a single dimension. Let $F_{r-1}(i)$ represent the $i$th number in an Fibonacci sequence of order $r-1$. We choose a constant $I$ so that $\beta'_{I+a} \leq \phi^{F_{r-1}(a)}$ for an appropriate constant $\phi$ and $0 \leq a \leq r-2$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta'_{I+r} &\leq \left[\prod_{I<j<I+r} \frac{(\beta'_j)^{k-1}}{(k-1)!}\right] rc \\
&\leq \frac{rc}{[(k-1)!]^{r-1}} \prod_{I<j<I+r} (\beta'_j)^{k-1} \\
&\leq \frac{rc}{[(k-1)!]^{r-1}} \prod_{0<j<r} \phi^{F_{r-1}(j)(k-1)} \\
&\leq \frac{rc}{[(k-1)!]^{r-1}} \phi^{F_{r-1}(r)(k-1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

We can induct to see that the exponent of $\phi$ in the $\beta'_m$ values falls according to a generalized Fibonacci sequence of order $r-1$, leading to an asymptotic constant factor reduction in the number of overall rounds, even as we have to work over a larger number of subrounds.

### 7.1 Simulations with Subtables

We ran simulations for this parallel peeling algorithm with subtables with the same values of $r, k, n$ and $c$ below the threshold. Table 5 shows the results. The number of subrounds is at most $r$ times the number of rounds in the original parallel peeling algorithm, but our analysis of Section 7 suggests the number of subrounds should be significantly smaller. In this case, the factor is about 2.

We also did simulations on how closely the recursion tracks the number of vertices left after peeling the $j$th subtable in the $i$th round. Denote the expected fraction of vertices left in the recursion by $\lambda'_{i,j}$, and $\lambda'_{i,j}$ is

| $c = 0.7$ | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| $i$ | $j$ | Prediction | Experiment |
| 1 | 1 | 942230 | 942230 |
| 1 | 2 | 876807 | 876803 |
| 1 | 3 | 801855 | 801855 |
| 1 | 4 | 714875 | 714878 |
| 2 | 1 | 678767 | 678771 |
| 2 | 2 | 643070 | 643080 |
| 2 | 3 | 609686 | 609697 |
| 2 | 4 | 581912 | 581919 |
| 3 | 1 | 554402 | 554414 |
| 3 | 2 | 527335 | 527341 |
| 3 | 3 | 500469 | 500476 |
| 3 | 4 | 472470 | 472475 |
| 4 | 1 | 442874 | 442871 |
| 4 | 2 | 410958 | 410956 |
| 4 | 3 | 375770 | 375764 |
| 4 | 4 | 336458 | 336447 |
| 5 | 1 | 292159 | 292144 |
| 5 | 2 | 242396 | 242374 |
| 5 | 3 | 187891 | 187866 |
| 5 | 4 | 131789 | 131776 |
| 6 | 1 | 80372 | 80376 |
| 6 | 2 | 40582 | 40600 |
| 6 | 3 | 15481 | 15503 |
| 6 | 4 | 3649 | 3666 |
| 7 | 1 | 348 | 354 |
| 7 | 2 | 6 | 6 |
| 7 | 3 | 0.003 | 0.008 |
| 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 |

Table 6: Results of simulations of peeling with subtables on how well the recursion approximates the number of vertices left after $t$ rounds. The experiments are run using $r = 4, k = 2, n = 1$ million, over 1000 trials.

given by the formula

$$\lambda'_{i,j} = \frac{1}{r}\left(\sum_{h \le j} \lambda_{i,h} + \sum_{h > j} \lambda_{i-1,h}\right),$$

where $\lambda_{0,j} = 1$ for all $j$. The results are presented in Table 6, where the prediction column is given by $\lambda'_{i,j} n$. As it can be seen, this recursion closely matches the number of vertices left in the simulation.

# 8 Conclusion

In this paper, we analyzed parallel versions of the peeling process on random hypergraphs. We showed that when the number of edges is below the threshold edge density for the $k$-core to be empty, with high probability the parallel algorithm takes $O(\log\log n)$ rounds to peel the $k$-core to empty. In contrast, when the number of edges is above the threshold, with high probability it takes $\Omega(\log n)$ rounds for the algorithm to terminate with a non-empty $k$-core. We also considered some of the details of implementation and proposed

a variant of the parallel algorithm that avoids some implementation issues. Our experiments confirm our theoretical results and show that in practice, peeling in parallel provides a considerable increase in efficiency over the serialized version.

We believe this work spawns many open questions for further research. Our simulations suggest that the number of rounds depend on the values $k$, $r$ and $c$. In particular, when $c$ is close to the threshold density $c^*_{k,r}$, it takes considerably more rounds for the algorithm to terminate. A natural next step would be to analyze the growth of the number of rounds also as a function of $c^*_{k,r} - c$ or $c - c^*_{k,r}$.

A much more careful study of the issues arising in the implementation of parallel peeling algorithms would also be interesting. For example, in our IBLT implementation, two adjacent threads in the insertion or recovery process may make wildly divergent memory accesses, because each item is hashed to $r$ cells that are deliberately spread randomly throughout the IBLT. It may be possible to modify the hashing technique in a way the enables a higher degree of memory locality without significantly reducing the probability of successful recovery. More generally, there may exist complicated unexplored tradeoffs between the locality of memory accesses, space requirements of the data structure, and the degree of parallelism achievable.

## References


[1] Y. Azar, A. Broder, A. Karlin, and E. Upfal. Balanced allocations. *SIAM Journal of Computing* 29(1):180–200, 1999.

[2] A. Broder, A. Frieze, and E. Upfal. On the satisfiability and maximum satisfiability of random 3-CNF formulas. In *Proceedings of the Fourth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pp. 322-330, 1993.

[3] M. Dietzfelbinger, A. Goerdt, M. Mitzenmacher, A. Montanari, R. Pagh, and M. Rink. Tight thresholds for cuckoo hashing via XORSAT. In *Proceedings of ICALP*, pp. 213-225, 2010.

[4] M. Goodrich and M. Mitzenmacher. Invertible Bloom Lookup Tables. In *Proceedings of the 49th Allerton Conference*, pp. 792–799, 2011.

[5] R. Karp, M. Luby, and F. Meyer auf der Heide. Efficient PRAM simulation on a distributed memory machine. *Algorithmica*, 16(4):517–542, 1996.

[6] M. Luby, M. Mitzenmacher, A. Shokrollahi, and D. Spielman. Efficient erasure correcting codes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 47(2):569–584, 2001.

[7] M. Mitzenmacher. The power of two choices in randomized load balancing. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, 12(10):1094–1104, 2001.

[8] M. Mitzenmacher and E. Upfal. **Probability and computing: Randomized algorithms and probabilistic analysis**, 2005, Cambridge University Press.

[9] M. Mitzenmacher and G. Varghese. Biff (Bloom filter) codes: Fast error correction for large data sets. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, pp. 483–487, 2012.

[10] M. Mitzenmacher and B. Vöcking. The asymptotics of selecting the shortest of two, improved. *Proceedings of the 37th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication Control and Computing*, pp. 326–327, 1999.

[11] M. Molloy. The pure literal rule threshold and cores in random hypergraphs. In *Proc. of the 15th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pp. 672-681, 2004.

[12] A. Pagh and F. Rodler. Cuckoo hashing. Journal of Algorithms, 51(2):122–144, 2004.

[13] B. Vöcking. How asymmetry helps load balancing, *Journal of the ACM*, 50(4):568–589, 2003.

[14] U. Voll. Threshold Phenomena in Branching Trees and Sparse Random Graphs. Dissertation. Techischen Universität München. 2001.